

## Contents

### Page

258 ULSTER'S TWENTY-FIFTH  
HOUR  
*The Editor*

261 RENEWAL AND REVERENCE  
*Danzil Galvin*

271 INDIAN OCEAN: THE  
TEMPERATURE RISES  
*Nautilus*

277 CASTRO'S CUBA: THE  
DEATH OF A NATION  
*The Editor*

292 MRS. INDIRA NEHRU-  
GANDHI  
*E. L. Way*

299 CONTINUING CRISIS  
*J. M. Jackson*

309 ANY QUESTIONS?  
*William Lawson, S.J.*

315 "WE WILL BURY YOU"  
*Paul Crane, S.J.*

**CHRISTIAN ORDER** is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Road, London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

*Christian Order* is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

If You Change Your Address:  
Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

# Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane S J

---

VOLUME 12

MAY 1971

NUMBER 5

---

## Ulster's Twenty-fifth Hour

THE EDITOR

I MAKE no apology for returning once again to the subject of Northern Ireland, this time in an editorial. I do this because I am strongly under the impression that the great majority of Englishmen, fair and decent people though they are, have no real idea that the problems of that sad Province of the United Kingdom are insoluble without the implementation at grass-roots level of the reforming legislation passed by the Stormont Government under rightful and just pressure from Westminster. So long as members of the Catholic Minority in Northern Ireland are forced to feel outcasts in their own land; so long as failure to implement reforms continues to impose second-class citizenship upon them through social, economic and political discrimination at local level, frustration and despair will continue to be their lot; and they will continue to turn, as they have turned already, to those who tell them that the gun is the only answer to their problems.

This way, the circle becomes vicious and complete. Continued Orange intransigence enthrones the IRA gunmen as champions of the Catholic Minority in the North. The shooting starts. Then, by way of answer to the shooting,

Orangemen cry out for repressive measures and the rearming of the Royal Ulster Constabulary. Thus, Orange intransigence results in a situation which Orange extremism would "cure" with greater intransigence still. If Westminster allows Stormont to yield to the demands of men like William Craig and the Rev. Ian Paisley, the effect will be to provide the IRA gunmen with a stronger stance still, the shooting will increase and both communities in Ulster will be set on a road which can only end in all-out civil war. Out of that kind of conflict none will benefit except those Marxist forces whose aim is not to unite Ireland on a Christian and Catholic basis, but to subvert the country, as a whole, in the interests of Red Revolution. Let readers not laugh. I know what I am talking about. There are those today, high in the councils of the Left Wing of the IRA — or "Regulars" as they are called and sworn enemies, in the last analysis, of its "Provisional" or Right Wing — whose aim is to turn Ireland into another Cuba. What they want for all Ireland is the Hammer and Sickle via the Plough and the Stars. These men of the Left in the IRA give not a hoot for the true welfare of the Catholics of the North. Their aim is to use them like pawns, to step up the shooting on their supposed behalf into bloody civil war, out of which they will draw their Red Revolution. Meanwhile, they are helped vastly on their way by the blinkered stupidity and bigotted intransigence of Ulster's Orangemen who refuse to accord to their Catholic fellow-citizens in the North, just because they are Catholics, the basic elements of social and civic justice. How Conservative Members of Parliament can fail to see the basic problem of Ulster as that of the denial of justice to the Catholic Minority beats me completely. The zeal with which some of them lend support in the British House of Commons to Orange intransigence is something I find extremely distasteful. They would do far better if they were to listen to the solid common-sense of Mr. Heath and Mr. Maudling in this matter of Ulster and not to the more vocal of their blinkered companions.

The day these lines were written the Press carried news

of Major Chichester-Clark's resignation and likely replacement as Premier of Northern Ireland by Mr. Brian Faulkner. Commenting on this situation, the Premier of the Irish Republic, Mr. Jack Lynch, remarked that he was not interested as to who succeeded Major Chichester-Clark so long as the reform programme was pursued. He added:

"We expect the Downing Street declaration of August, 1969, guaranteeing equal rights to all people in the Six Counties, irrespective of religion or politics, will be implemented. I am satisfied, whoever will be there, that the British Government are determined to have the reform programme carried out".

I share Mr. Lynch's expectation. Because of it I end this editorial on a note of hope.

---

### *National Priorities*

William Proxmire, the Senator from Wisconsin (D), put the case against the SST, the supersonic transport, in a characteristically straightforward manner on the Senate floor. He said:—

"This year we will spend only \$208 million for mass transportation for literally millions of people to get to work. But we are going to spend \$290 million here to provide a relatively small portion of the American people the means to fly overseas more rapidly . . ." He won his case, but the sad thing is that as a result Boeing in Seattle which only three years ago employed 101,000 aircraft workers will now only employ 27,000 . . . Somehow the citizens of the U.S. thought that if the cities cannot afford to pay to have the garbage collected, the SST must be a senseless luxury. — E.L.W.

The agnostic rationalism of the Victorian and Edwardian eras has left our own age bankrupt with regard to the things of God. We live with men who have lost sight of reverence because they have lost sight of God. Mystery has gone from our lives and it is going from the life of the Church whose members have been influenced more than they realise by the secularism of the contemporary age. What the Council Fathers failed to see, perhaps, was the havoc that rootless Progressives would work with their well-laid plans.

## Renewal and Reverence

DENZIL GALVIN

IN one of his more prescient moments the late Dean Inge wrote: "Modern man has no God, no devil; he lives without reverence, without admiration, without fear". The western man of today, encased as he is in a materialistic, mechanistic and mass-media society, is indeed in a unique position in history compared with bygone ages. For, as the French Catholic writer, Georges Bernanos, pointed out: "The civilisations that came before the machines were undoubtedly the result, in many respects, of a certain number of transformations, moral, social or political. But, in the beginning, these changes took place very slowly and as though within the framework of a certain fixed order. Man could thus take advantage of past experience even if he had, in practice, forgotten its teaching. At each new crisis he rediscovered in himself the same reflexes of defence or adaptation that had served his forefathers in the like case. Our troubles today cannot be compared to those, for instance, that ravaged Europe after the fall of the Roman

Empire. We are not witnessing the natural passing of a great human civilisation, we are witnessing the birth of a new, inhuman civilisation which can only be established by a vast, an immense, a universal sterilizing of the higher human values of life".

### *Agnosticism and Change*

The spiritually stunted and morally moribund state in which western society finds itself today has come about on two planes — the intellectual and the material. The former process began with the break up of Christendom at the Reformation when men took their stand on justification by faith alone which, in the New Enlightenment of the eighteenth century, became justification by "reason" alone. It was the new breed of agnostics of the Victorian and Edwardian eras who then wedded "reason" to the current scientific discoveries to produce — scientific humanism. Men like Freud, Havelock Ellis, Shaw, Wells, the Huxleys and Haldanes, with their rejection of God and their distorted notions of a subjective morality, are thus directly responsible for the social, moral and sexual standards which influence and propel the ordinary man today. Parallel with this percolating and pervasive prostitution of the minds of men has been the transformation of the material environment at a speed and intensity that has produced psychological stresses in the mode and conduct of day-to-day living; the flight from the country (and therefore from Nature) into the sprawling and soulless cities, the depersonalisation of the individual in the mechanistic, mass-producing industrial and commercial milieux. For many the only solace is the "religion" of drugs, pop or trivia in general.

### *Reverence Goes as God Goes*

It is the coalescence of these two developments — the intellectual and material — which have made modern man's soul and mind particularly vulnerable. For having been robbed by his intellectual mentors of a belief in God and spiritual values and left with an atrophied moral sense, he is

now at the mercy of that modern phenomenon — the mass media of communication — which reflects and extends these same standards of behaviour. Having no God (or at best a woolly belief in "Something up there") to revere, it is not surprising that many people begin to lose the habit of reverence for everything else — whether it be for one's country and its institutions, for one's parents or for life itself. The mass media, pandering to the lowest common denominator of the contemporary *mores*, thus abrases and coarsens the sensitive and reverential side of people's nature. One has only to look at the obsession with sex and the cult of violence in the theatre and cinema and the induced self-flattery of many advertisements.

The symptoms of this decline of reverence in secular society are manifold and are the logical outcome of a situation where God has been dethroned and man seen only as a self-sufficient animal answerable to his subjective ideas of "reason" and "morality". The effects are seen most clearly in the loss of respect for the sanctity of human life; the "convenience" of contraception, abortion and euthanasia blurs the moral sense of otherwise good men who would recoil from visibly and directly destroying a human life. We see it in the debasement of sex into a means of "virility" and "fulfilment" by itself instead of as a sacred vessel for the love between husband and wife, in the loss of respect for womanly chastity and modesty reflected in the grotesque products of misogynous dress designers. Bereft of God, divorced from the softening restraints of Nature, it is no wonder that a society obsessed with material interests gradually loses all sense of wonder and reverence.

### *Self-Congratulation in the Church*

What it may be asked has all this got to do with the Second Vatican Council, with renewal and reverence? It has everything to do with it. The Council spoke to millions of Catholics who, willy-nilly, are part of this amorphous, secular society. The conciliar documents often refer to the body of the faithful as "The People of God" — words

which have a genuine sense in the ecclesiology of the Church. But the phrase in its practical and psychological impact within the present divisive trends in the Church has unfortunate overtones. It suggests a certain complacency and self-congratulation as if being members of the Church automatically made us all enlightened Christians. No wonder it is a favourite catch-phrase of the Neo-Modernists who use it (quite wrongly) to "democratise" and upgrade the role of the laity in the councils of the teaching Church. The truth is of course that the mass of Catholics may be "The People of God" on Sundays, but for the rest of the week they are part and parcel of the secular *mores*, influenced in varying degrees by the standards of their own particular milieux and by the pervasive nostrums radiated by the omnipresent mass media of communication.

### *Vulnerability of the Catholic Mind*

Certainly one can say that Vatican II rightly bade us look forward and strive to reintegrate the Word of God with a post-Christian society; it produced a majestic series of documents reaffirming the nature and authority of the Church, the pastoral task of clergy and laity in a changing world, on true ecumenism, on religious freedom, and so on. The Council, like all the great ones in the past, marks a milestone in the history of the Church but — as with all Councils — can only be judged in the perspective of time. History when evaluating Vatican II will, I think, say that both Pope John and his advisers, as well as many of the bishops in council who supported the changes and innovations, greatly underestimated the strength of this "secularised" Catholicism already entrenched in the Church. For this Neo-Modernism, confined not just to an intellectual minority but diffusing its way down and infecting a new breed of Catholics forming part of the secularised, classless societies in Europe and America, did not come into being overnight because of Vatican II. For this vulnerability of the Catholic mind the Church must take her share of the blame. The period between the two Vatican Councils was marked

by a great series of papal encyclicals covering the whole sweep of moral and social life; the faithful, especially today's Progressives, cannot say that the Church has been silent about the problems of the modern world, that she has failed to give them guidance. Nevertheless, in the fields of Catholic education and apologetics as they affect Catholics' involvement with the world and their spiritual and mental ability to withstand and refute secularist philosophies and modes of conduct, it is a valid criticism to say that the Church could have done much more. The results we perceive today.

### *Pseudo-Christianity Replaces Revival*

Never before in the history of the Church have there been so many theologians, bishops, priests and laity so full of a burning sense of admission; never before so many mini-popes and verbalisers ready to belittle the Church's institutions and traditions, to question the authority of the magisterium on faith and morals, and to distort the teaching of Church and Council to fit their own subjective ideas. This is not the "renewal" intended by the Council. It is a pseudo-Christianity born of a lack of conviction in the institutional Church and her sacred mission as the expositor of the divine and moral laws. At heart, it is a loss of reverence for what the Church stands for; and the remorseless consequence is that a watching world in turn loses any respect it once held for the Church. The great criticism to be levelled against Vatican II is that it did not at the time keep a tight enough rein on the eager and progressively-minded reformists and innovators waiting in the wings; that some of the changes and innovations decreed by the Council have only served to encourage this breakdown in the spirit of reverence and discipline within the Church. Never more so than in the heart of a Catholic's expression of his faith — his worship.

### *Reverence and Ritual*

The character and ritual of the great ancient religions of the world had one thing in common; they always embodied and radiated an olympian awe that somehow

strikes a chord in the human soul. Their gods were just that much mysterious and inaccessible to arouse curiosity and reverence in the worshippers, and yet not so remote that the essence and symbolism of the ritual could not satisfy the people's yearning for worship and make meaningful the action going on before them. The Church in her wisdom evolved over the centuries a form of worship which preserved this delicate balance between the mysterious and the mundane. The historic Roman Mass was (as Newman pointed out in an oft-quoted passage) all things to all men, meeting the needs of those who found in it the mystical setting for individual communion with God or, in the dialogue Mass, a way for all joining with the priest in the communal act of Sacrifice. It was the well-spring of reverence and contemplation and of that spirit of humility and self-oblation without which no renewal of one's self or of the Church is possible.

### *Threat of Inner Impoverishment*

Now there is no reason to doubt that both clergy and laity (as distinct from the deliberate innovators) are trying to implement the new Order of Mass as reverently as is possible. What I am saying is that the changes in the liturgy contain the seeds of a gradual process whereby the emanations of discipline, wonder and reverence built into the old Mass will be diluted if not lost. For the language, form and emphasis of the new rite drain the Mass of that essential *afflatus* — the evocation of the transcendental and the divine — by drawing the people *en masse* into a plethora of vocal and physical activity, by no means always a sign of an empathy with the sacred realities of the Sacrifice offered. The rite seems to be based on the dubious premise that physical participation is synonymous with spiritual communication; that the constant repetition of Scriptural readings to the congregation will by itself deepen their spiritual experience and reverence. The actual changes in the ritual — the downgrading of the priest's awesome role to that of a kind of "president", the relegation of tabernacle and altar

in favour of a "table", the whittling away of the acts of obeisance by priest and people, the physical involvement of the worshippers with the sacred vessels and wafers, the virtual elimination of silence and time for private prayer and contemplation — all combine to diffuse the essence of reverence and mystery that is the hall-mark of true worship. Over-accessibility to the Mystery of the Mass will beget an over-familiarity which in turn becomes mere formalism. No doubt with this danger in mind, Pope Paul voiced (April 1970) his concern over the decrease in private prayer and contemplation "thus threatening the liturgy itself with inner impoverishment, with an outward ritualism that could become purely formal practice".

### *Iconoclasts at Large*

The undermining of these essential elements of mystery and reverence in the Mass proceeds in other ways at the hands of liturgical fanatics and innovators. In the new churches built specifically for the new liturgy where the stark interiors look more like cinemas than places of worship; where the Real Presence is relegated to a side-chapel or room, the "table" becoming the focus of a "worshipping-room" denuded of the traditional and well-loved pictures and statues. In many of the older churches, altars and rood-screens have been ruthlessly "re-arranged" or removed entirely. In America and on the Continent one reads of sacred vessels, pictures and statues thrown out by the new reformers which end up for sale in public markets. These iconoclasts gain a peculiar satisfaction from experimentations with the Mass which drain it of the sacred and the divine; using it as a vehicle for their socio-political beliefs, complete with "demo" style "hymns"; as a "folk" Mass (sometimes with cinematic) aids) to appeal to the young; emphasising it as a "eucharistic meal" in place of the Sacrifice to further a false ecumenism. They elevate the self-edifying concepts of "the People of God" and "the Priesthood of the People" to a level with if not above that of the priest-celebrant. Communion for them becomes the focus of the Mass, the "meal" of group spiritual

edification. All this obsession with self-expression in the Mass is the very antithesis of the true spirit of humility and reverence before the altar of God; it is self-reverence.

### *Credibility of the Church Undermined*

The danger of this loss of true reverence at the centre of the Catholic's form of worship is serious enough because the dispositions engendered there can radiate out and coalesce with progressive trends and lessening disciplines elsewhere in the Church, thus producing among the faithful a weakened respect for her unique position as the interpreter of Revelation, of the divine and moral laws. The Neo-Modernists, with a complete lack of reverence, already question the Church's teaching on such issues as papal authority, freedom of conscience, contraception and celibacy. Now they are asking if Catholic schools are really necessary and are pressing for relaxation in the Church's teaching on the indissolubility of marriage and on confession. To-morrow will it be contraceptive abortion? At least one can pin-point and refute the arguments used by Neo-Modernists to change the Church to their way of thinking. (Unfortunately these refutations do not appear to get the same publicity and support from the Press and the bishops as do the constant and vociferous outpourings of the Progressives.) It is, however, the psychological effect upon the minds of ordinary Catholics of changes in the liturgy, of the theological and moral subversion of the progressives, and the host of smaller innovations and changes in traditional disciplines, which, in their *cumulative* effect can undermine the general credibility of the Church, so far as they are concerned and, in consequence, their reverence for it.

### *Loosening of Discipline*

One thinks of examples of the general loosening of discipline within the Church. Some, no doubt, are innocuous enough in themselves when viewed in isolation; but they affect every day and influence the minds of most Catholics. Relaxations in the laws of fasting and abstinence; the

toleration of women attending Mass without head-covering — once regarded as a sign of reverence; the dress and disposition of some priests and religious, especially in Europe and America, trying to saccharise their identity in order to appear "with it" to the secular world; the rash of ecumenical fervour which now permits Catholics to attend Protestant services and encourages the use of joint churches; relaxations of the rules governing mixed marriages, which allow joint wedding services and now only ask the Catholic partner to "endeavour" to bring up the offspring as Catholics. Is not the *totality* of such concessions, together with the Church's apparent loss of nerve, going to blur the uniqueness of Catholicism in the minds of ordinary Catholics and make her appear, especially to coming generations within her flock, as no more than one church among others?

### *Church not True to Herself*

The nature of the crisis in the Church lies not in the Progressives' explanation that she has failed to keep pace with a changing world and must now adapt her language, theology, disciplines and structure to suit the modern mind. No, the Church finds herself in crisis because, humanly speaking, she has failed to be true to herself; failed, not continually enunciating her age-old truths and condemning the errors of the secular world, (this the magisterium has always done) but in producing sufficient numbers of the Faithful mentally and spiritually equipped to resist the challenge of secularism and to carry the banner of Christ into the enemy's camp; failed because (as the trenchant Archbishop Murphy of Cardiff recently put it) "at this moment, when the world needs us so desperately, even though it may be unaware of the need, we are tempted to drop back on the defensive with one idea in mind — not to lose out, not to offend. Just when the world needs the Catholic Church we seem to have lost our nerve. This is not because we have lost the Faith or have any misgivings about its message. It is just because at this moment there is such an atmosphere of tolerance and love that any firm

pronouncements on the moral law, whether we like it or not, seems to be provocative, insulting and interfering".

### *A Church True to Her Mission*

Throughout her history the Church has acted as the great corrective to the shibboleths of the age and it is indeed a tragedy that at the moment she is not fulfilling this role. One may ask — has she made serious psychological errors by, firstly, diluting the supernatural *frisson* and elements of reverence and contemplation of the Mass in favour of a "popularised" version where these very qualities are lacking; and, secondly, relaxing many of her disciplines at a time when the world needs the example of restraint and order? For it is more than likely that, in the years to come, the secular world, in a reaction from the suffocating pressures of modern life, may well seek that Christian religion which can offer it not only an assured and disciplined faith but a way of worship providing the recuperative powers of reverence and contemplation. To meet such a challenge, it seems to me that the Holy Spirit will have to produce another St. Augustine to revitalise the Church. Certainly a Third Vatican Council will be necessary (and much sooner than in a hundred years) to bring back to the Church a serene and confident leadership not afraid to slay error within, a liturgy once more a power-house of reverence and prayer, and a truly unified and loyal "People of God" who will fruitfully present "the wild Truth reeling but erect" to the world outside.

In a previous article published earlier this year, Nautilus drew a picture of Russian design in the Indian Ocean. Since then, Soviet activity has increased and counter-measures have been taken by Britain and the United States. Moreover the independent island countries off the East Coast of Africa have been showing mounting concern. As a result, it is not unlikely that new alliances will be formed, which were never even contemplated a few years ago.

## Indian Ocean: the Temperature Rises

NAUTILUS

LENIN and Lewis Carrol bore close, if surprising, resemblance to one another at least in this, that each invented something that was and was not at the same time. Beyond this point, however, all similarity ceases; the Cheshire Cat and Dialectical Materialism have nothing further in common. On the contrary, Dialectical Materialism in practice is infinitely more tricky and dangerous than the delightful animal, which turned out in the end to be no more than one huge grin. Dialectical Materialism, of course, may have a large element of that in it as well, particularly when it keeps on promising — and always to the next generation but one — peace and joy and freedom for all mankind. But, as a weapon of political warfare, it is devoid even of this degree of whimsy. On the contrary, the Marxist Dialectic, in the hands of the Soviet Union's strategic planners, always insists that things are not what in fact they are, but what they are supposed to be. Moscow provides no evidence in

support of this contention: all it does is repeat, in the face of questioning, what it said in the first place. At the same time, all who doubt Soviet veracity are dubbed perverters of the truth, fascists and enemies of mankind.

### *The Soviet Union's "Un-sea"*

Last year, for example, the Soviet Government laid it on with great emphasis over the mass media that Russia had no interests to pursue in the Indian Ocean. Apart from the peace-loving cruises of admittedly obsolescent Soviet warships, the Indian Ocean, so far as the Soviet Union was concerned, was no more than an "un-sea", as blank from the Soviet Union's angle, as the charts once used by the hunters of the Snark. There was, therefore, according to the Soviet Union, no need whatsoever to produce evidence as to the non-existence of Soviet naval activity on the island of Socotra, near Mauritius and in the Maldives. There was no need because it simply was not there. In evidence, the radio of the Marxist Republic of South Yemen — not long ago Britain's Aden Protectorate — made two statements on the subject. The first was a flat denial that anything in the nature of warlike preparations was taking place in the area. The second was in the shape of an announcement that a group of "peace-loving" journalists and diplomatic representatives of "people's republics" had visited Socotra and seen with their own eyes that there were no naval or military installations on the Island or in its area.

The same line was adopted a little later by Radio Mogadisho and the tightly muzzled Press of the Somali Republic whose government was taken over in October, 1969 by a Marxist-Socialist military group. The name of the official and only daily paper in Mogadisho, the capital of the Somali Republic, is now *Stella d'Ottobre*, in witness to the propinquity between Somalia's revolution and the most recent of the Sudan's revolutions which took place in the same month. Above all, the name bears witness to the October Revolution, which brought the Soviets finally and firmly to power in the Soviet Union nearly fifty-four years ago.

## *India and the Soviet Union*

These moves over the radio in witness to the lie that there was no Soviet naval and military presence in the Indian Ocean were co-ordinated with a further move, made in the Russian interest, at the Commonwealth Conference at Singapore last January. Sardar Swaran Singh, India's Foreign Minister, informed assembled journalists that the Indian Government had received no intelligence to the effect that the Russian Government had bases or other naval facilities in the Indian Ocean. This was an astonishing statement. He proceeded to an even more astonishing denial that India had ever offered any logistical support to the Soviet fleet. In actual fact, all four of India's submarines are Soviet-built and the same applies to some of her other light naval craft. This does not, of course, make India an ally or satellite of the Soviet Union; neither does it alter the fact that the majority of the ships of India's navy have been built by Britain. It is, however, only fair to add that, for some time already, preferential treatment and facilities in India's naval yards have been on offer to ships of the Soviet fleet. This could well be by way of repayment for India's Soviet-built submarines and other naval equipment.

The neutral-plus attitude of India to the Soviet Union since the break-up of Britain's Indian Empire must be considered as a significant factor in international affairs, particularly as they concern Asia. It was the Czar, Peter the Great, who first dreamt of the conquest of India. On at least two occasions in the next century and a half — in 1801 and 1885 — it came close to being attempted. It would be surprising if, today, the Politbureau had shelved it completely. Nobody, of course, imagines that it could involve, within the foreseeable future, a direct and massive intervention of the Red Army in Indian affairs. Nevertheless, it is worth remembering that the military occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1968 would have been an unthinkable blasphemy for the majority of ardently pro-Russian Czech sentimentalists in 1945. One should remember also that there are now at least

three Communist Parties in India today and that the State of Kerala in the South is under Communist control.

### *Diego Garcia*

On December 17th of last year Moscow Radio, broadcasting in English to South-East Asia, thundered against the official announcement of the British and American Governments that it was their intention to build a joint naval-cum-air base on the Island of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. The announcement said the base was to be ready in three years time and that it would comprise an air strip capable of taking the heaviest bombers, docking facilities for ocean-going submarines and a communications centre. Moscow's comment was that all this was "just another link in the total chain of the United States and British war preparations in the Indian Ocean. In order to justify somehow their war preparations and to delude world public opinion, the Americans and British Governments have claimed in their announcement that they are pursuing only defensive goals".

### *Disinformation as a Weapon*

At this point, it is well worth noting that, whatever we may think about the mental ability of the Soviet Union's top rulers, their top technical and political advisers are by no means stupid or ill-informed. On the contrary, some of them like the late Akademik Kurchatov, the moving spirit of Soviet interplanetary projects, ranked amongst the very best brains in the world. Moreover, in the East as well as the West, in countries outside the Soviet Union and its Satellites, the Russians have managed to retain the allegiance of professional people who are outstanding in their own fields. The influence exercised by these in support of Soviet plans should never be underestimated.

Within the Soviet Union itself, the real professionals at the top of the country's political structure, are best described as very, very highly qualified practitioners in the exercise and enjoyment of naked power. Neither would the Commissars dare to make statements contrary to the deliberate and in-

formed opinions of these men. And one of the weapons they use to best effect is that of disinformation. The enemy is deliberately and effectively puzzled to the point of complete confusion and the means chosen is to shower him with a load of cant, deliberate lies and downright nonsense: "Boojom is Snark, you see" could be coined effectively by any Soviet operative. Hence the preposterous allegation that the militarization of Diego Garcia by this country and the United States is in the interest only of a double-faced, imperialist design: "The growing colonialist ambitions of the United States and Britain have produced indignation in Asian countries", pontificated Moscow Radio in its English broadcast for South-East Asia. It is, as a matter of fact, very much more likely that the steps taken by the two Western Powers to counter Russian ambition have been greeted by the peoples of the area with profound relief.

### *Africa's Island Countries*

The Indian Government is philo-Russian and the Burmese Government is the same, if only for the fact that Burma's chief enemy is Communist China. Madame Bandaranaike, the Prime Minister of Ceylon, is, for reasons best known to herself, openly pro-Soviet. But no illusions are harboured by Africa's island countries to the West of the Indian Ocean. Some months ago, Jacques Rabemananjara, the Foreign Minister of the Malagasy Republic, expressed his concern over the Fisheries Agreement, concluded in the last months of 1970, between the Soviet Union and Mauritius. Shortly after this, Commodore Iskander Desta, the Commander-in-Chief of the Ethiopian Navy, paid an official visit abroad H.I.M.S. Ethiopia to Madagascar. Admittedly, the Ethiopian Navy is neither strong nor particularly formidable. It came into being only ten years ago. Nevertheless, it acquires itself adequately in the ding-dong warfare it wages with saboteurs and gun-runners in the Red Sea. The movements of both are controlled and directed by the Arab States whose frontiers line the opposite shore and the operation is financed by the Soviet Union. The whole of

Ethiopia's coastal area along the Red Sea from Ras Dumeira to Ras Kasar — and to depth of ten kilometres inland — had been made subject to martial law. The ports of Massawa and Assab are exempt from this general rule, but the approaches to both are under constant patrol by the Ethiopian Navy. It maintains close contact with Kenya's nascent navy, based on Mombasa and equipped for the time-being with light, ocean-going MTB's.

Against this background, it would seem sound to say that an official visit by the Commander-in-Chief of the Ethiopian Navy to the southern tip of the Indian Ocean Front can hardly be rated as no more than a minor gesture of goodwill.

### *New Alliances?*

It would be not only unjust but malicious to suggest that President Tsiranana of Madagascar in any way condones apartheid. Things being as they are, however, some form of naval and military co-operation between the Malagasy Republic, Mozambique and South Africa would appear to be inevitable. Djibouti, as well as the Comore Islands — where a new Government presided over by Prince Said Ismail was denounced recently by Leftists as a "capitalist lackey" — could, in an emergency, along with the Malagasy Republic, count on direct aid from France. That very powerful overseas striking force — France's Eleventh Light Division — could be deployed tactically in any of these three countries.

Somalia, at the moment, is not considered by Soviet strategists a safe prospective base. So far as they are concerned, the Chinese are too thick on the ground there and the same applies to Tanzania. One way or another, East African leaders from North to South, on the mainland or adjoining islands — irrespective of race, creed or colour — are being forced to think in terms of defence against a sea-borne threat from the East. It is not unlikely that, sooner than most think or desire, they will have to consider fresh alliances, consistent with the protection of their countries' integrity, though not, perhaps, in themselves attractive.

## CURRENT COMMENT

Two major subjects are considered in this month's "Current Comment"—the present position of Castro's Cuba and the nonsense of neo-Malthusians in the West, who advocate contraceptive planning as an answer to the exaggerated poverty of the developing world.

# Castro's Cuba: the Death of a Nation

THE EDITOR

THEY rang the church bells when Castro and his victorious guerillas came marching into Havana a little over twelve years ago. Had they known then what we know now the bells could never have been rung. I am afraid it is always like that. Men tend to look short. They never take the longer view. They grasp the moment. And the moment looked good in Havana on that day in January, 1959 when Castro and his freedom fighters came pouring into the streets of the city. A bloody tyranny had been swept away and the tyrant, Batista, had fled. It seemed like a new dawn that day in Cuba, especially for the poor whose life-blood was being drained away on sweated wages in the canefields. Anything, for them, was better than that. In Castro they found new hope. Now that he was in power the poorest, at least, would come into their inheritance.

What has the inheritance turned out to be in Cuba? After just twelve years of Castro what do the Cuban worker and his family get from the revolutionary regime?

## Rations and Queues

The answer is brutal and short — rations. Edouard Bailby, a correspondent of the London *Observer*, filled out the details on August 2nd, 1970. This is what he said: "Day and night, queues form outside shops, restaurants, cafes, food stores. One must queue for three, four or five hours to buy what the ration card authorises — 15 eggs per person per month, 3 kilos of sugar, 1½ pounds of black beans, 1 bottle of beer. Plus, for each household, 1 cake of soap, 1 roll of toilet paper, 1 tube of toothpaste. During my stay in Cuba I was unable to obtain a postcard, writing paper, toothbrush or buttons. Everything is rationed. In the cafes I couldn't even get a glass of beer or cup of tea — the waitresses had nothing but glasses of water to offer customers".

This, presumably, is paradise; this is what Communism has brought to Cuba since Castro turned to it for the solution of his country's problems twelve years ago. "I've had enough", a housewife told Edouard Bailby, "I spend several hours a day in these queues". She found the free public services and housing, which Castro has given the Cuban people (in what quantity or quality I do not know), along with free maintenance and education of children up to the age of sixteen, insufficient compensation by far for the meagre rations she drew at very high cost for her family after hours of queueing. As usual, in Cuba, it is the women who suffer most, the housewives who pay for the social experiments of Castro's Communist regime; not the new class of Cuban bureaucrats who run the country on Castro's behalf. These are doing well. You will see them today riding round the Island in newly imported Alfa Romeos for which they have ample petrol. Their fine new cars match their standard of living, which is far above the people's heads. In Cuba, as in all Communist countries, in order that all may be equal some have to be more equal than others. I know of no exceptions to this rule; which means that Communism, in reality, represents no more than an exchange of servitudes. Its effect is to substitute one set of exploiters for another.

### *Many Vote with their Feet*

With this great difference, however, that the new is far worse than the old, if only for the fact that, whereas there could be protest against injustice under an exploiting capitalist regime, there can be none against Communist exploiters. "There is", in the words of another correspondent, "no outlet (in Cuba) for criticism or protest" (W. D. Ryder in the *Daily Telegraph* for August 20th, 1970). There have been no elections in Cuba since Castro took over. All independent newspapers were suppressed in 1960. The Island has two government controlled dailies. It also has forty journalists in gaol.

Until the end of May, 1970, there was one way of saying what one thought in Cuba. It was with one's feet. All who made application were allowed to leave the Island. Many took advantage of this offer. More than half a million people have fled the country since Castro came to power. They did so, though all their possessions were taken from them beforehand, whilst they themselves were treated as social outcasts after application to go was made and compelled, by way of final indignity, to do a last stint of forced labour in the canefields or at other forms of heavy manual labour before their departure. Now, even this has been stopped. Too many were leaving Cuba and labour is needed increasingly in the canefields. Indeed, a decree putting "idlers" to work was contemplated only recently and may by now have been passed. Meanwhile, anyone even *applying* to emigrate is penalised for having entertained such a thought. He is liable to be transferred straightaway to a new and less responsible job, is given poor housing and remains a suspect for the rest of his life.

You cannot get out of Cuba now. The Island, in other words, is a prison: all its people are in gaol.

### *In Debt to Moscow*

Cubans have nothing to look forward to. Worse still, they cannot change what they have. In Cuba, Castro has all power in his hands and the Soviet Union has all power

over Castro; which means that it has all power over the people of Cuba. It is, however, not interested in the people of Cuba. It is interested in their Island, which it virtually owns and which it is busy converting into a military and strategic base. For the people of Cuba the Soviet Union does not give a damn. They are no more than slave-accessories to be kept going if necessary and at a cost of U.S. \$1m. a day for the sake of a highly prized island base. Neither are the dollars given. The Soviet Union never gives anyone anything. All is by way of loan, for which payment in some form is always demanded. At the moment, Cuba owes Communist Russia U.S. \$2,300m. The money will not be repaid for a long time, but the Soviet Union has got what it wanted. Cuba has been taken over and turned wholly to Soviet purpose; if Castro failed to do the bidding of his Soviet masters he could be toppled tomorrow. Meanwhile, the price he pays for the image of independence allowed him by Russia is a very big one. Here it is.

### *The New Satellite*

Ten thousand Soviet "advisers" report back to Moscow on every detail of Cuban life. This is one inevitable consequence of Cuba's position as a Satellite within the "Socialist Commonwealth" of Soviet Russia. Others are as bad or worse. The Soviet stranglehold on the Island has forced Cuba to turn herself into an operational base to provide facilities for the expansion of the Soviet fleet in the Caribbean. More specifically, the construction of the Soviet nuclear-submarine base at the deep-water harbour of Cienfuegos — now reliably reported as completed — increases immeasurably the extent of the Soviet threat to the Americas. The complex at Cienfuegos is rounded off, so to say, with a radar equipped communications centre which serves as a command station for controlling Soviet submarines throughout the Caribbean; and a radar intelligence ship, installed last September, which monitors the area and which, it is estimated, will double the Soviet

Union's nuclear-submarine capacity in the United States waters. Off Cuba's south coast, the islet of Cay Largo was completely taken over by the Russians as long ago as 1962: they have built there an airstrip, garrison buildings and ten underwater submarine pens. More ostentatiously, Soviet naval units have been visiting the Soviet Union's newest colony — for that, in fact, is what Cuba is — fairly regularly since 1969. Last year, there were three such visits. And last year, also, there were visits of another kind: in the month of April, 1970, two TU-95 long-range Soviet reconnaissance aircraft flew non-stop from the Soviet Union to Havana. It was the first time Soviet aircraft of this type had ever landed outside the Soviet Union. It will certainly not be the last. The implications are too obvious for discussion.

### *Economic Chains*

Just in case the wretched Cubans — including Castro himself — might be inclined to buck against their present servitude, there are further safeguards. There always are with the Soviet Union, and they are usually economic. By agreement, Russia takes five million tons of sugar each year from Cuba at six cents a pound, which represents an inflated price. What this means is that the Soviet Union can always dump on the open market the sugar it has bought from Castro. The threat of doing so — with the disastrous consequences for Cuba's economy, which is based on sugar — is sufficient to extract subservience in the same way that subservience was extracted from the Ghanaians through Soviet purchase of their cocoa by special agreement when Nkrumah was in power. Castro can shout and rant and make a fine show of independence: in reality he is no more than a Soviet puppet on a string. And if by any remote chance Soviet-bought sugar failed to keep him there, petrol certainly could. Ninety-five per cent. of Cuba's petroleum supplies come from the Soviet Union.

## *Swallowed by Soviet Sea-Power*

The point, I think, is made. It need be pushed no further. Cuba is an island of serfs. What Castro has brought his people is not freedom, but slavery. But I have no time, indeed, for the plundering depredations of monopoly capitalism. I have still less for those who see the state capitalism of Communism as its cure. These should have their heads examined. So, too, should the egg-heads, from Jean Paul Sartre downwards, who come back enraptured from a two-week visit to Cuba and talk of the wonders wrought there, as if Castro was some kind of genius. He is no genius at all. Any fool can cure unemployment if he cares not a scrap for freedom. All he need do is turn his country into a prison and put the prisoners to work. I see nothing clever in that; only the low cunning of the successful thug, deceiving first, then trapping, then enslaving through forced labour. This process is not particularly difficult anywhere. It is particularly easy in small island countries which are manageable by reason of their small size, without land borders and, therefore, without escape routes. Their people can easily be made prisoners; all the more so if they are fool enough to yield to blandishments set against a back-drop of present discontents. What people fail to see is that the worst of these can never be as bad as the best that Communism can offer. They fail to see also that the Soviet Union, at the present time, has a growing interest in the enslavement of small island peoples. The growth of its sea power makes bases essential. Cuba would mean nothing to Russia were it not for its ships in the Caribbean. Now, it has been swallowed by Soviet sea power.

## *Spare the Shepherd; Strike the Flock*

What of the Church in Cuba? The story is old and familiar, yet still barely heeded. In Cuba, the Church's children are being stolen from her by stealth. There has been little outward persecution. Neither will there be, for Castro knows, as the Soviet Government itself knows, that the blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church. So far as

Cuba's Communist Government is concerned, the Catholic Church in Cuba must be made to wither and die; its influence over the people of the Island eroded through a policy which has been well described as that of sparing the shepherd and striking the flock. Thus, for Castro, concordat not contestation is the order of the day: within the shell of a church-state agreement, the Faith of hundreds of thousands of Cubans — particularly, of course, the young ones — is being shaved away as the years go by. Ways and means are the same everywhere in the Socialist Commonwealth. In the first place, drastic reductions in the numbers of clergy and religious; of the 720 priests in Cuba when Castro came to power only 228 are left today, making 1 priest to every 33,700 Catholics. Again, and typically, the Cuban Government confiscated 324 Catholic Schools as well as the Catholic University of Havana in 1961. Children, therefore, have been forced into State Schools and, in the State Schools, religious instruction is forbidden, whilst the text-books in all subjects are no more than vehicles for Marxist indoctrination. It is true that religious instruction may be given in the Island's churches. It is also true that any priest leading a group of children to catechism class is liable to be hauled off to police headquarters. Moreover, priests and seminarians are not now exempt from military service, whilst Catholics are discriminated against when it comes to all forms of State employment. There is, of course, no chance of a political career for anyone who professes the Catholic Faith, whilst university places are much harder to come by for Catholics than for anyone else. Atheism pays in Communist Cuba. It is a place where you can have the whole of Castro's ersatz world in return for your immortal soul.

### No Bills Now

The story is the same everywhere in the Satellites of the Soviet Union. The method never varies. An example of its application in Russia was given by a correspondent in the London *Times* for January 22nd, 1971: "Although the Soviet constitution 'guarantees' freedom of religious belief,

in practice a teenager may have to conceal his or her faith to avoid attention which may amount to persecution, and may even be deliberately failed in his or her examinations on grounds of religion". This is the line throughout the "Socialist Commonwealth" of the Soviet Union. The Faith is being squeezed out of the rising generation. In Cuba the young are being spiritually dehydrated. They must be, if Communism is to succeed; for Communism is the enemy of man and his dignity, Catholicism the upholder of both. Of their very nature, the two are and always must be irreconcilable opponents. There can never be peace between them. Each is the enemy of the other.

That is why the church bells could never ring with joy in Cuba today. Were they allowed to ring at all, it would be in mourning for the death of dignity in a once-free nation.

## Press and Population

It can be said with near accuracy that scarcely a day goes by without the appearance somewhere in the Press of a warning from someone concerning the dreadful consequences certain to follow what is described as the increasing over-population of the world. Thus, for example, on March 7th last, in an article in the *Sunday Times*, Nigel Lawson wrote of the developing countries, where it (the population problem) is not a problem but a disaster: where it is not pollution but the ghost of Malthus that stalks the land". And the very next day the *Times* carried a short description of a Labour Party pamphlet entitled, *Population*. This was described by a correspondent as pointing "to the contradiction of the most impoverished nations *living under the constant threat of famine* (italics mine) while developed nations such as America or Canada produce large food surpluses".

The mentality is Malthusian and the doctrine identical with that which the notorious clergyman preached at the end of the eighteenth century when the population of England and Wales was not a quarter of what it is today. What the doctrine of Malthus amounts in the mind of contemporary Malthusians is this; technical improvements

in agriculture may come, but they are always followed by a growth of population, so that people are no better off than before.

### *The Opposite is True*

In a typically trenchant article published first in the *Melbourne Advocate* and then in *Christian Order* (September, 1969) and reproduced recently as a pamphlet by the Australian Catholic Truth Society (¹), Professor Colin Clark argues with his usual well-informed brilliance that the exact opposite is, in most cases, the truth: in other words, creative energy and technical improvement do *not* precede population increase; population increase not merely stimulates, but appears as essential to the stimulation of both. In Clark's own words:

"... population increase generally comes first, and then, usually with great reluctance, people adopt technically more efficient methods because they have to provide for the increased population. The strongest reason for believing that things work this way round is that almost every technical improvement in agriculture involves, in its initial stages, harder and more disagreeable work than the methods previously used. Technical knowledge, in most countries, is available well ahead of the actual adoption of technical improvements.

"Africans know about more intensive systems of agriculture, but do not practise them because they are more laborious, until compelled to do so by the growth of population, which must thus be regarded as an economically beneficial factor. We can trace such economic effects of population growth all the way up the scale from primitive hunting and fishing communities, through various crude forms of agriculture, to intensive agriculture with its careful preservation of soil fertility".

(¹) *Putting the Population Explosion in Perspective*; Australian C.T.S., 145 a'Beckett St., Melbourne, 3001, Australia; pp. 16; 7 cents.

## *Greeks, Dutch and British*

In support of this thesis, which knocks the bottom out of the neo-Malthusians, Professor Clark goes on to cite the example of four peoples stimulated by the pressure of population growth on resources to great outbursts of creative energy, which enabled them with comparative ease to provide their growing populations with steadily rising living standards. The examples used by Clark are those of the early Greeks, the Dutch at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the English in the second half of the eighteenth and the Japanese in the late nineteenth.

### *In the case of the Greeks:*

"As early as the seventh century B.C., the poet Hesiod was complaining bitterly that the country was becoming over-populated and that things were not as easy as they had been a generation or two earlier. By this time, Greek immigrants were already building commercial cities on uninhabited land all around the Mediterranean; they had got as far as Marseilles by 622 B.C. A century or two later, when Greek civilisation was at its height, most of densely populated Greece was living by manufacture and commerce or the production of specialised crops for export".

### *In the case of the Dutch:*

"The next example which we have of a people outrunning their agricultural resources are the Dutch, trying to make a living on their scanty sandbanks, at the beginning of the seventeenth century. This pressure of population on resources provoked one of the most astonishing outbursts of national vigour which the world has ever seen. After fighting Spain, the greatest military power of the time, to a standstill, the Dutch rapidly transformed themselves into the leading maritime and commercial power of the world. In 1653, they founded New York. At the same time they were founding Cape Town and Jakarta and discovering Australia. And the work of Dutch painters and

scientists during this period made an imperishable contribution to the culture of the world".

In the case of the British:

"By the second half of the eighteenth century, it was clear that the old easy-going agricultural methods could no longer support the increasing population of the island. Large numbers emigrated to North America, where they married young, enjoyed good health, and produced a rapid population increase. This population increase is the indubitable reason (as European historians point out) why the language, law and culture of North America now is not French or Spanish. The British who stayed at home also affected at this time a radical transformation of their society — economic, political and cultural — outstripping the achievements of the Dutch in improving agricultural and industrial techniques, and producing an outstanding science and literature.

"Writing in 1798, the Rev. Thomas Robert Malthus, whose ideas have done so much harm to the world, apparently quite unaware of the improvements in agriculture and industrial technology which were going on all around him, contended that with 10 million people, Britain was greatly over-populated and what was needed was not any form of contraception (which he condemned outright), but a universal encouragement of late marriage. Had the rapid increase of the British and Irish population, which began about the middle of the eighteenth century, not taken place, the United States and Australia might never have come into being, and Britain would have remained an unprogressive eighteenth-century agrarian community with the rest of Europe following her example."

### *The Japanese*

It is to be noted that it is precisely this fate — I am sure without knowing it — that the neo-Malthusians all around us are wishing on the developing world.

## In the case of the Japanese:

When the Emperor Meiji began the modernization of Japan in 1868, it was far poorer and more primitive than any Asian country is today; moreover for fear of the political interference which might come with it, he forbade his people to accept any foreign loans or financial aid, though he was very glad to import technicians and teachers. From this inauspicious beginning, Japan has shown a sustained rate of economic progress more rapid than that of any other country. (The high rates of economic growth claimed by Russia, and accepted uncritically by so many American economists, collapse as soon as they are subjected to any close examination; and the true long-period rate of economic growth in the Soviet Union is substantially lower than in the United States or Western Europe.) The most interesting fact about Japan throughout this period in which population was rapidly increasing is that, contrary to what is generally supposed, the production of food from Japanese agriculture and fisheries was all the time increasing faster than population, quite apart from the food which the Japanese were able to import in exchange for their manufactured exports. The increase in food production depended upon a few simple but extremely important technical changes; the selective breeding of higher-yielding strains of rice (a very long and slow process), the use of chemical fertilizer, and the motorization of the fishing fleet. But these technical changes could never have been so thoroughly adopted had it not been for a concomitant reform. As early as 1899, Japan established universal education. This was a most courageous decision for a country as poor as Japan was then. India is still very far from this object, and Russia did not establish universal education until as late as 1931. Quite apart from the inherent value of education, I think that the evidence is convincing that it has been education, in the long run, which has been the

principle factor in Japan's outstanding economic progress . . .

"What Japan did in the nineteenth century is something which India, whose population is now rapidly growing, can do in the twentieth. There are no grounds for despair. The amount of land available per person is far higher than in Japan; science and technology are now much further advanced, and other countries, particularly the United States, have been generous with economic aid. We now have enough evidence to measure the rate of economic progress in India since 1948, and although the figures fluctuate considerably from year to year with variations in the harvest, on the average both agricultural and industrial production in India are growing substantially faster than population".

### *An Inescapable Conclusion*

The conclusion from all this is, I think, inescapable; those today who are calling for population control in the developing countries — particularly the President of the World Bank, Mr. Robert McNamara, who appears to be making aid — programmes conditional on the adoption of contraceptive and other population-control measures by the countries concerned — are not increasing, but *decreasing* their ability to attain an improved standard of living for their people. This is so because contemporary contraceptive programmes are depriving developing countries of that pressure of population on resources which historical analysis reveals as essential to the stimulation of economic growth. If the neo-Malthusians have their way, it is not unlikely, therefore, that the developing countries of the world today will suffer the same fate as France, which began family limitation as early as 1780 and put off for a hundred years the beginnings of an economic advance sufficient to raise the standard of living of her people. In the words of Professor Clark:

"The country which did listen to Malthus was not Britain but France, where a heavy fall in the size of the family began in the early nineteenth century. As the

leader of the French delegation said, unanswerably, at the recent World Population Conference, if population restriction were a way of achieving economic advancement, France would be the richest country in the world by now. French economic development is now proceeding rapidly, but it started late. Leading French economic historians agree that one of the principal causes of this late start was the nineteenth century check on population growth".

### *Some Further Facts*

In support of the foregoing historical analysis, which is based on fact not prejudice, there are further facts which lend it overwhelming weight today and, indeed, make fools of the neo-Malthusians in our midst. The facts show that there is no reason whatsoever to have any fear with regard to the increasing population of the world. A final quotation from Professor Clark's pamphlet — from which I have quoted extensively for the sake of my readers, for he is an authority on this subject — is now in order:

"There is hunger and malnutrition in the world, but to nothing like the extent of half or two-thirds of the world population. Most of it is to be found in China, where it is due to Communist mis-government, and in India, where there is enough food to go round, but the lower castes are systematically kept hungry and denied economic opportunities. Agricultural production has been advancing faster than population, not only in the advanced countries, but in almost every country in the world, to the point where there is considerable anxiety about being able to sell agricultural produce . . . The menace of world food shortage (which has been exaggerated in any case) is over, and the world is now faced with the very different problem of a prospective glut of agricultural produce . . . I do not wish to claim that the world is free from hunger and malnutrition. There are certain limited areas in Africa, Asia, New Guinea and Latin America whose in-

habitants live primarily on root crops. There is real danger here of protein malnutrition. Over most of these continents, however, people live on grains, mostly containing 10 per cent or more protein, which will meet requirements if supplemented with fresh fruits, vegetables and small quantities of animal feed . . . . If the Indian farmer cultivated his land as carefully as the Japanese, he would obtain nearly four times the yield of rice from the same area . . . . In Africa only about 3 per cent of the potentially cultivable land is actually cultivated in any year. Even in Asia there are large reserves of good potential agricultural land still untouched, to say nothing of Latin America and Australia".

And here is a very last quotation with which these Notes may fittingly conclude. It sums up the present situation and prospect as well as I know, putting paid once and for all to the moans of the neo-Malthusians:

" . . . even at our high level of consumption (that of Western Europe, Australia and the States) the world's available agricultural land could feed over 40 billion people, before we made any attempt to reclaim mountains or deserts, or to obtain food from the ocean. If we consumed and produced in the manner of the Japanese, who after all are quite a healthy people, our space requirements would be reduced to one-third of this, and we could provide for three times as many people".

---

Mrs. Gandhi has had a spectacular win in the Indian election, the fifth election since Independence. E. L. Way describes the election, the lack of issues, the subsidies of the 279 maharajas, and the strengths of some of the parties at dissolution.

## Mrs. Indira Nehru-Gandhi

E. L. WAY

WHY the Nehru-Gandhi? Because this is the name by which Mrs. Gandhi and her two sons wish to be known. She married in 1942 an unknown journalist, Feroze Gandhi, who was not related to the great Mahatma. Feroze was not a Hindu but a Parsi. And in the nature of things both he and his wife found themselves in prison in the middle of the 'Quit India' campaign. Later on Feroze became a promising politician and they all moved into the house of Mrs. Gandhi's famous father: Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. The Nehrus were and are a wealthy family. Jawaharlal's more moderate father, Motilal, used to have his shirts laundered in Paris — that is before he saw the light and put on homespun for political demonstrations. Feroze Gandhi died of a heart attack in 1969. And Mrs. Gandhi has in moments of stress complained of her loneliness: 'I have nobody, *nobody*.'

Immediately after a political leader has won an overwhelming victory at the polls one should be decidedly on guard not to be carried away with enthusiasm for the new 'great' leader. Remember the fuss they made over Georges Pompidou? Overnight an ex-banker from Rothschilds was transmogrified into a financial wizard and a political genius by our right-wing press. I warned at the time (*After de Gaulle*, CHRISTIAN ORDER, June 1969) that he was unlikely to set the Seine on fire as far as the vast majority of the French people were concerned. And he hasn't. The social-economic mixture is as explosive as ever: there are too many

20-year-olds without jobs, housing is totally inadequate, there are not enough schools, and the docks have strikes of 12, 24, and 48 hours' duration so frequently that many big firms are swearing that they will never use a French port again. If Mr. Ford is looking for cheap labour, free of strikes, he had better not extend his empire to French territory. There the unions are seriously considering *auto-gestion* where pay and work have no connection, management hierarchy is abolished, and all decisions are made by the democratic method of asking the workers for a vote. With 500,000 jobless, and the figures rising rapidly, France could have another May 1968. In the meantime the conservative philosophy of giving business a free hand, reducing taxes, cutting government expenditure is everywhere being shown to be unworkable in this the eighth decade of the twentieth century. As Professor Paul A. Samuelson, Nobel prize winner for economic forecasting, says: "The rights of property shrink as the rights of man expand".

### *The Recent Election*

The recent (March) election in India was on a continental scale. The electorate alone numbered more than the population of Canada and the United States. It was estimated variously at 270, 271, and 278 million. According to one press report there were 342,000 polling stations; and according to another 300,000. The remotest villager would have a polling station not further than 2,000 yards. In the last election it was 2 miles. (One would have to travel by camel or bullock cart, miles from the nearest railway station in a roadless area to know what the setting up of so many polling stations must have meant. India is so vast that during the *Raj* there were Indians who had never set eyes on an Englishman.) There were over 150,000 police, home guards or troops involved in looking after the voters and the polling booths. The assassination rate was 6 a day; and up to the moment of writing the tally is 80 killed in Bengal. One of the 2,785 candidates when just about to be knifed to death asked his murderers: "Why do you want to

kill me? I haven't done anyone any harm?" He was 76 years old.

### *The Issues*

The opponents of Mrs. Gandhi had one thing in common: a desire to be rid of her at any price. This was summed up by the slogan, *Indira Hatao* ('Remove Indira'). She is hated by the 279 maharajahs and wealthy businessmen as much as Roosevelt was hated by American big business. The maharajahs would lose their tax-free subsidies amounting to £2,505,000 (\$6,000,000) a year. But to do this Mrs. Gandhi must have a majority sufficiently large (two-thirds) to amend the constitutional safeguards for private property. (Before the election it was said that she would have a good chance of picking up 240-250 seats. But by March 15 with results in from 514 of the 521 seats Mrs. Gandhi's Congress party had gained 350. She thus has a majority of over two-thirds). She surprised everybody by winning the Bombay constituency where there were 12 candidates, and her party man was said not to have a ghost of a chance of winning. He romped home with more than a 100,000 majority. Her party also swept Delhi and Mysore state. She therefore has certainly proved that if she was the issue — as she said she was — the people want her; and have given her enemies the boot. Her triumph has been spectacular. Several small parties have disappeared without trace in Bengal . . . . She will have to be guarded against assassination, even though her killer already hiding in the wings probably knows that he will be torn to pieces by an infuriated mob.

Her speeches (14 a day) during the election followed a simple pattern. She reminded the people that she was a Nehru; that she had been working for the people all her life; that she was for the small man, and that is why she nationalised the 14 major banks: so that small farmers and small businessmen could easily obtain credit. (Nationalising banks is not all that revolutionary. Italy has its four major banks controlled by the State as well as two of its largest investment firms.) She would ask the crowds: Do

you think my way is the right one, or the way of the big boys? And she would invariably end with the plea: 'Strengthen my hand.' The opposition case was a hodgepodge put forward by the 4-party coalition and amounted to little more than talk about 'growth' — a true respect for democracy — and a scream to 'Remove Indira.' Well it is her enemies who have been removed. And throughout India the small man has hope for a season. Mrs. Gandhi's strength lies in what she told a foreign reporter five years ago: "I don't look at a person as a Hindu or a Muslim. I am not identified with any state or group." She is in fact accepted more than any other Indian politician by all language groups, religions, and castes. (They have even heard of her in England which seems to become more parochial and self-centred every day.)

### *The Symbols*

Where two out of every three persons are illiterate it was necessary for the parties to be represented by symbols. The cow feeding its calf was the symbol of the ruling Congress Party, which held 228 seats at the dissolution. The opposition Congress party, which split the Congress Party in November 1969 because a Muslim, Varaha Venkata Giri, was appointed as President of the state by Mrs. Gandhi, chose as its symbol a woman at a spinning wheel. (At dissolution this party held 65 seats.) Other party signs were a hammer and sickle (Communist Marxist, 19 seats), a banyan tree (Socialist, 17 seats), a lamp (Jana Sagha, rightist and militant Hindu, 33 seats), a star (the Swatantra, the party that believes in free enterprise, 35 seats); and independents who seemed to favour a bicycle as a symbol.

The voters were given a wooden stamp, ink-pad and a small glass-rod which was dipped in indelible ink. An official shows the voter the ballot paper on which the symbols appear, explains the symbols and who the candidates are, and hands the ballot paper to the voter. The voter enters a curtained booth and presses the wooden

stamp against the ink pad and marks his paper. He is then finger printed, and his name is marked off on the voter's register. The votes of districts are mixed so that candidates who are defeated cannot wreak vengeance on districts that voted the 'wrong way'. This has happened in the past not only in India but in the Philippines. Untouchables have also in previous elections been threatened by the landlords. Voters now are more involved with parties and issues; and think for themselves rather than vote according to the orders of the leaders of caste or community — these were formally called 'vote banks'. (Power and property for the very few have been preserved in much the same way everywhere.)

### *New People*

Mrs. Gandhi's ruling Congress party appealed to the 20 million youngsters who in this the fifth election since independence were voting for the first time. God knows how many of them will ever have jobs. They say: "You can always tell the old Congress. Look at them. What do you notice? They all look alike. They are the same orthodox old men. Same grey hair. Same Nehru caps (white coarse linen). Same white dhoti. The same khadi-clad potbellied old roosters. Now look at Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and her men. They all look modern. So the difference is not ideology, just that the old Congress wants to do tomorrow what the new Congress wants to do today." Mrs. Gandhi retains her bright-eyed look of youthfulness. And even if she remains in power for another five years (and is not murdered) she will still be younger than either her father or Mr. Shastri was on first becoming Prime Minister. (Of course she has made mistakes: her dithering over devaluation, and the devaluation itself was a disastrous performance.) But she has made herself indispensable to the Indian people; and this is an achievement for someone who was looked upon as a stopgap successor to Mr. Shastri. (Pope John was a stopgap Pope.) All the nonsense talked by her enemies of her personality cult, about her

wish to become a dictator, about her being rejected by the people if it came to a vote — all this disappears with her spectacular triumph . . . Five good harvests helped. A bullet or a bad monsoon may stop her.

### *The Curse of 'Religion'*

That a foolish religion can ruin a people is abundantly plain. The Aztecs had been told by their prophets to expect white mounted gods from the east. Four hundred Spanish horsemen from the east destroyed a really powerful empire because it was superstitious. Look at the paper any day and you will see the havoc of really foolish religion. This morning for example I read that "Dutch medical authorities are trying to persuade stern Calvinist villagers to have their children inoculated against a polio outbreak which has already affected 25 children in the area. Two children died on Thursday. Hundreds of residents in Staphorst, in eastern Holland, a last stronghold of Calvinism, have refused inoculation on religious grounds."

And India is cursed with its fatalism, with its cow worship, with its hideously unjust caste system, and with its swarms of religious loafers who regard work as the greatest of all sins, that is if you judge them by their practice and not by what they say. Fatalism: as a child Mrs. Gandhi was often left with her grandmother — her other relatives being entertained by the British government in jail for months at a time. Her grandmother was a strict Hindu who believed that the Nehrus were suffering for dreadful sins committed in former lives.

Cow worship: when I was in India before the Second World War there were 156,000,000\* head of cattle. Some of the most miserable specimens on four legs to be found on the planet. In bad seasons they ate sheets of dirty newspaper, and their ribs protruded through their starving bodies. To kill a cow is worse than murder. To let it starve to death in a cow hospital an act of great merit.

\*Today there are about 176,000,000 cattle, about a quarter of the world's cattle population.

As for the caste system, Gandhi once said of it "There is an ineffaceable blot that Hinduism carries with it, . . . this miserable, wretched, enslaving spirit of 'untouchability' . . . It is, to my mind, a curse that has come to us; and so long as that curse remains with us, so long I think we are bound to consider that every affliction in this sacred land is a proper punishment for the indelible crime that we are committing" (quoted by R. C. Zaehner in *Evolution in Religion*, Oxford, p.89, 1971). Having condemned the crime, we humans continue to profit from it — until a tidal wave of wrath sweeps us and it away.

Worst of all was the savage warfare between Hindus and Muslims. With what relish they murdered one another to satisfy their spiritual needs. The end of the *Raj* in August 1948 dissolved the Britain-Indian controversy "and was soon found to have left little but goodwill behind it. But it left in clearer relief the Hindu-Muslim controversy, which was not so much resolved as transmuted. The murder of an estimated half a million people on both sides and the migration of over ten millions at the time of partition in 1947 was the price for this transmutation of unresolved tension" (*The New Cambridge Modern History*, Vol. XII, p.321).

Indiraji, as with respect and affection she is called, said during the election ". . . things can't change overnight. It's a long slow process". She has the climate, and the religion, and a social structure arthritic with age and apathy to contend with; a land in which everything is postponed until tomorrow — manana. A beautiful and terrifying land with its creamy yellow mango blossoms, its lepers, its myriads of birds — the landscapes in the west are lifeless in comparison — its cholera and smallpox, its Taj by moonlight, or in the dawn seen from the railway, but above all its millions of people, an estimated 90 million in Uttar Pradesh alone, its heartland, which I crossed eighteen times from south to north and from north to south in what now seems another life.

With nearly 900,000 unemployed why should prices be rising? What is inflation? What are the causes behind our present inflation? What is the difference between cost inflation and demand inflation . . . ? The government's policy in wage settlements (N-I), each one being at a lower rate than the last contains the seeds of conflict. Nor is it true that it does not matter where the inflationary circle is broken.

## Continuing Crisis

J. M. JACKSON

AT THE time of writing it looks as if the postal strike is virtually over, although there is no sign of a settlement of the Ford dispute, the railwaymen appear dissatisfied with the offer made to them, and talks over teachers' pay have broken down. In the case of Fords, there are clear indications that the company is preparing to limit the range of operations in Britain, and that certain overseas factories may cease to obtain supplies of components from Britain. But whilst there are continuing troubles over wage claims, prices continue to rise, yet at the same time unemployment is higher than it has been for many years and there is even talk of the unemployment level reaching a million by the end of the year. The situation is very different from what has confronted Britain in recent years. Rising wages and prices are nothing new. But rising prices have usually been associated with boom conditions and full employment. Now unemployment is rising at the same time as prices. What has gone wrong?

### *What causes inflation?*

Inflation has often been defined as 'too much money chasing too few goods'. This, however, is neither a satis-

factory definition nor a satisfactory explanation of inflation. For the moment, it will be enough to think of inflation as a general rise in the level of prices. There will always be some goods that are going up in price, but this would not matter if these price increases were offset by other goods falling in price. Some goods might rise in price because of a temporary increase in the demand for them, or because the supply had been temporarily reduced—if the raspberry crop is poor, prices at the height of the season will tend to be higher than is usual. Some goods might be falling in price because supply had increased—a good crop of agricultural goods, for example, or perhaps a lower cost technique has been introduced in some area of manufacturing. Under inflationary conditions, however, the price increases tend to be more numerous or more marked than any decreases.

Economists usually offer two explanations of how inflation comes about. It is far too simple to say that we insist on paying ourselves money incomes which increase more rapidly than the output of goods and services on which these incomes are spent. How can this happen? Where does the money come from? Is it the payment of the excessive money incomes which causes prices to rise, or is it in some sense the other way about—the rising money incomes are a result of the inflationary situation? The answer to these questions depends upon the kind of inflationary situation prevailing. There is demand inflation and cost inflation. The former arises when an excessive demand for goods and services in general is present. It is this excessive level of demand which forces up prices, and may also lead to a rise in money incomes. Earnings may go up because overtime is worked to try and meet the demand for goods and services, employers may offer higher rates to attract workers, and so on. Claims for higher pay from the trade unions in this kind of situation do very little to push up wages, or at the most divert some income from profits to wages. Certainly it is not the wage demands that start the inflationary process going.

Clearly we are not suffering from demand inflation at the present time. Excessive demand for goods and services means that there is full employment, and that even with full employment there is not enough being produced. With massive unemployment, the level of demand is insufficient to require all the available labour to be employed. Today we are suffering from cost inflation. It began in the last year or so of the Labour government's period of office. A sharp rise in costs was inevitable when the pound was devalued, although this effect took quite a long time to work its way through the economy. When the pound was devalued from \$2.80 to \$2.40, it meant that an article which was priced in America at \$2.80 would rise in price from £1.00 to £1.16. Imported goods would rise in price by roughly 16 per cent. If imports form about, say, one-third of the goods consumed in this country, the cost of living would rise by something over 5 per cent.\* The pressure of rising prices stimulated wage demands, and this pressure for higher wages was reinforced by the relaxation of the incomes policy in the months before the election. The relaxation—whether or not it was as cynical a piece of electioneering as it appears—was made at the worst possible time. Just when costs were inevitably being forced up by the consequences of devaluation, an unrestrained scramble for higher wages gave a further twist to the inflationary spiral. But whereas in most of the post-war period, the pressures making for rising prices have come primarily from the demand side, they are now coming from costs. No longer is it a case of prices rising because there is a buoyant demand and unions taking advantage of the situation to get higher wages; now prices are rising because costs are rising, and now that devaluation will have worked its effects out it is wage costs in particular that are responsible for rising prices.

\* The rise in the cost of living would be less if some imported goods did not rise by 16 per cent. This would be the case where goods were imported from countries which followed us by devaluing their currencies.

## *Restraint and Equity*

Prices are rising because the unions continue to press for higher wages, even in the face of increasing unemployment. The obvious remedy is to curb the rate of increase in wages. It is no use the unions arguing that they need pay increases to maintain their standard of living in the face of rising prices. Devaluation inevitably meant that many people in this country would have to accept a lower standard of living, a fact that the government of the day was reluctant to admit. It is not just a matter of changes in the relative prices of British and foreign goods. The object of devaluation was to improve our balance of payments, to increase exports and reduce imports. With a constant level of production in this country, increasing exports and reducing imports could only mean that the volume of goods and services available for consumption and investment at home was going to be reduced. Our standard of living was bound to fall. The rise in prices resulting from devaluation was part of the mechanism by which this would be achieved, and under such conditions it is quite wrong to suppose that workers generally are entitled in some sense to be compensated for increases in the cost of living. There may be a special case for compensating the lowest paid, but that is another matter. It would be wrong, however, to assume that because the rate of increase in wages has to be curbed *any* curb on wages is desirable. There must be some regard for the equity of the wage and salary structure unless a situation is so desperate that a complete freeze becomes necessary.

Clearly the size of wage claim that is being submitted at the present time is ridiculous and irresponsible by any standard. In normal times we might expect an increase in the national product of about 3 per cent, and that is roughly the rate at which wages should increase if prices are to remain stable. Given a rate of inflation of 2 or 3 per cent in other parts of the world, we would not get into difficulties in export markets if our own wages were to rise at a rate of 5 or 6 per cent. Any increase much beyond

this is likely to give rise to serious difficulties sooner or later. Moreover, the present claims cannot even be justified by reference to the rise in the cost of living. Prices rose last year by substantially under 10 per cent. An increase of something in the region of 10 to 12 per cent would, therefore, represent an increase of perhaps 3 or 4 per cent in real terms—but at a time when production is stagnant and the goods and services are not available to provide this real increase. But claims are going in for 15, 20 or even 30 per cent. Some of the more extravagant claims, even when allowance is made for the fact that an initial claim is merely a move in the game of bargaining and does not represent real union expectations, are absolute nonsense.

The government has resisted suggestions for the introduction of a formal, statutory incomes policy. It has preferred to rely on persuasion, trying to bring down the level at which settlements are being reached. The idea that there should be this gradual reduction in the level of wage settlements in itself contains the seeds of conflict. When one group of workers has obtained a settlement of 10 per cent, another group making a claim later is not going to be entirely happy with 8 per cent, even if an increase of as little as 6 per cent might have been acceptable if this were all others were getting. This government, like the last and the Prices and Incomes Board, seem to think that it does not matter where the inflationary circle is broken. This is not true. Consider, for example, the case of two jobs requiring comparable skill. One group of workers may be paid £20.00 a week and the other £18.00—19 per cent of the rate for the first group. Now suppose the first group get a 10 per cent increase and the second only 8 per cent. The new rates for the two groups will be £22.00 and £19.44. This is only just over 88 per cent of the rate for the first group; the differential has widened in both absolutely and relatively. This suggests two possible ways in which the squeeze on wages should be applied. First, if possible, it should be applied with differential severity. A group of workers who are relatively well paid for the job

they are doing should at any point of time be allowed smaller increases than those who are relatively badly paid (that is, paid less than most workers doing jobs of comparable skill and responsibility). Secondly, if it is inevitable that there should be a gradual deceleration of the rate of increase in wages, it becomes desirable to maintain the squeeze over a longer period so that when the next round of increases comes those who were first in the queue and got big increases will be kept to a small increase this time whilst more is allowed to those who were more severely dealt with the first time.

An incomes policy (and a policy does not cease to be one because it is not statutory) that is applied as a matter of expediency in times of crisis is bound to create anomalies and injustices. There is the particular danger that the government will use its powers to limit the increases given to workers whose pay is under its direct control, whilst private industry chooses to ignore the government's exhortations. This was what happened in the 1961 'pay pause' and what could be happening to some extent at the present time.

### *The Need for Information*

There is a great deal more that could be done to ensure that the public is properly informed of the basic facts of the situation when there is a wage claim which threatens to develop into a serious dispute. All kinds of figures may be quoted by both sides to bolster up their case. There are so many different rates of pay which may be quoted—basic rates, average earnings before deductions, take home pay in a typical week, take home pay in a week when earnings are particularly good or bad (when, for example, there is no overtime or payment by results bonus). The most reliable figure for comparisons is obviously average earnings before deductions. It is no use citing a worker whose take home pay is apparently very low. He may be a single man paying a lot of tax. Moreover, there will be some men in any industry who

are receiving only basic rates and whose take home pay will be low. It would almost certainly be possible to find somebody in the motor industry whose take home pay was well under £20.00 a week. The only reliable guide, therefore, is earnings.\*

In comparing average earnings, it should be remembered that the average earnings of men in industry (manual workers) are now about £27.00 to £28.00 a week. It is inevitable that the average for some industries will be above this overall average and that in others it will be below. There will also be a considerable spread within each industry. It may be that in a good many industries we can find workers whose pay is unreasonably low, and, of course, something should be done about this state of affairs. But the solution is not to allow the existence of such cases to determine the whole character of a pay settlement. If some workers are getting only £17.00 a week, say, and this is felt to be too little, the answer is not to give everybody a 10 per cent increase instead of a 5 per cent one on the basis that bringing the low paid worker up by 10 per cent to £18.70 will give him a living wage. This approach is a recipe for inflation which will leave the lower paid worker as badly off as before. The solution is rather to give some kind of differential increase to the low paid.\*\*

### *Rolls Royce and All That*

There have been some spectacular business failures in recent months. There has been a tendency for the number of bankruptcies to increase, and this is no doubt part of the present economic situation. The more spectacular failures, however, while they may add to the difficulties of

\* Ideally we should have details of the distribution of earnings within an industry or occupation, but this would be much more difficult to produce.

\*\*This is not arguing the case for a general narrowing of differentials but for treating the very low paid as a special case. It may be that we need to take a radical approach to the present wages structure. Injustices often arise because a few workers are on a very low basic rate whilst most workers receive substantial additions to the basic rate (of which overtime is only one and not necessarily the most important).

the present situation are not necessarily caused by it. The Rolls Royce failure was the result of a bad contract over the RB 211 engine contract. If there had appeared a prospect of the engine being developed at a cost that would have made sense in relation to the contracted price, no doubt finance would have been forthcoming from private or governmental sources. At any time there will be business failures because a firm has gambled on a particular venture and it has proved unsuccessful—either because costs are much higher than anticipated or because the product does not catch on with the potential customers. Similarly the failure of the Vehicle and General Insurance company was the result of its having too many eggs in the motor insurance basket.\*

Nevertheless, the Rolls failure will add to the problem of unemployment, and so will the failure of other concerns, perhaps as a more direct result of the present economic climate. The increase in wage costs combined with a general economic situation characterised by stagnant demand and credit restrictions may well create difficulties for many firms. They may try to pass wage increases on to consumers in higher prices, but their sales may fall. Faced with higher costs, unable to get more credit from the banks, and perhaps unable to increase their sales revenue (because higher prices may be accompanied by falling sales), a situation may develop where the firm just cannot pay its creditors and may be forced into bankruptcy, even though its long run prospects would have been good if finance could have been obtained to tide it over present difficulties.

### *The Budget*

By the time this article appears, the budget may have been introduced, or will certainly be due very shortly. In

\* Motor insurance has been highly competitive and unprofitable. There has been a reluctance to advance premiums as rapidly as costs. Companies with a wide range of business have been able to carry the losses on motor insurance; those specialising have been unable to bear losses resulting from low premiums but unable to raise premiums because they would then lose business to other firms and with reduced premium income would be unable to meet their liabilities.

either event, it is relevant to ask what ought to be done in the budget in a situation such as that now facing the country. Most observers are now thinking in terms of some kind of boost to the economy. In particular, the National Institute for Economic Research has called for a cut in indirect taxation. If taxes are cut, but not government expenditure, it means that taxpayers, finding more money in their pockets will be able to spend more. This additional spending will mean that more people will be employed in order to meet the increased demand for goods. Some cuts might also be made in direct taxation. The government has already indicated an intention to reduce the standard rate of income tax from 41 per cent to 39 per cent, but since this reduction was made possible by the imposition of charges, the money given away with one hand will be taken back with the other (though the amounts given to and taken from any individual need not be the same) there will be no increase in the demand for goods and services. Any additional cut in direct taxation ought to be made by raising the present personal allowances. There has been a reluctance in the past to increase these allowances as inflation has reduced their real value. As a result, the level of income at which people start to pay income tax has tended to fall, and a position now exists where many people are paying income tax although their post-tax income is less than they would be entitled to under Supplementary Benefit.\*

If the economy could be revitalised, it might go some way to overcoming the dangers of the present wages explosion. The rate of growth of national product is unlikely to exceed 3 per cent over a long period, but it should be possible to achieve something considerably in excess of this during the next year or eighteen months. There is considerable unused capacity in the economy at the present time, and we should be able to achieve the normal growth

\* Indeed, one could make a strong case for a very substantial increase in the personal allowances, from something like £465 for a married couple to £700, accompanied by a 3 per cent increase in the rate of tax in order to produce the same yield.

of 3 per cent plus something extra as this excess capacity is taken up. If, for example, we have to accept the likelihood of wages rising by 10 per cent over the coming year, this could imply an 8 per cent or more increase in prices of 3 per cent plus something extra as this excess capacity if there is no increase in productivity.\* If, however, there is a 6 per cent increase in the output of goods and services available for consumption, the rise in prices will be very much smaller.

Nevertheless, it will be necessary to keep a close watch on wage increases. As incomes increase with the fall in unemployment, more will be spent on both home and imported goods. There will be some deterioration in the balance of payments. It is essential therefore that this deterioration should not be aggravated by excessive price increases of British goods as a result of an uncontrolled wage-price spiral.

\* This is based on the assumption that wages account for 75 per cent of the cost of all goods.

---

### *Inflation Heaviest for Twenty Years*

The UN Economic Commission for Europe reported that inflation in Western Europe in 1970 was more widespread and stronger than at any time in the last twenty years. In eight out of thirteen industrial countries wage increases had been greater in 1970 than in any other year during that period.

The major factors behind the inflation were rising wages and exceptionally marked and widespread increases in wholesale prices of manufactured goods. — E.L.W.

Whose judgment am I to accept: Fr. A's that contraception is always wrong, or Fr. B's, that it may often be right? Can psychological experiments produce mystical experiences? What do I answer to my social psychologist whose lectures suggest that our behaviour is not free? One of my lecturers says he has "no use for Thomas Aquinas". Ought I do anything about it?

## Any Questions?

Whose judgment am I to accept: Fr. A's, that contraception is always wrong, or Fr. B's, that it may often be right?

Since when has this priest or that priest, or this bishop or that bishop, been the *magisterium*, the teaching authority in the Church? That authority belongs exclusively to all the bishops headed by the Pope, or to the Pope alone. The answer to your question is simple: accept the judgment which coincides with the teaching of the *magisterium*.

You then go on to ask further questions. What is the Pope's teaching on contraception? It is in the Encyclical "Humanae Vitae". How are you to know that the encyclical is a magisterial pronouncement and therefore binding in conscience on all members of the Church? You know from the language of the encyclical itself: the Pope is plainly exercising his office of custodian of Christ's revelation, stating the law of God, and directing his teaching on a most serious moral problem to the whole Church. Since the publication of the encyclical he has frequently and emphatically reaffirmed the same doctrine. There can be no doubt what the Pope thinks is the force of his teaching; and that, as the Council said, is a fact in the circumstances of papal teaching which is decisive for the obedience of the faithful. What Fr. X may think is negligible.

It is a puzzle how priests can take it upon themselves to lead people away from the direction clearly indicated by the Head of the Church. Perhaps the kindest judgment one can make is that some of them are overwhelmed by the hardship they meet in their pastoral work; and in their distress at the difficulties of their flock they approve of measures which seem to give immediate relief, though the Pope has condemned the measures as wrong in themselves. The pity is that, besides being blind guides, they burden the Church with the scandal of gross disobedience.

Can psychological experiments produce effects like, for example, the mystical experiences of St. Teresa of Avila ?

No. Psychological experiments and their effects belong to the natural order, and mystical experience belongs to the supernatural order: they are worlds apart. The initiative in mystical union lies with God. He is not to be summoned by human beings, as though he were at their beck and call, like a genie in a bottle. The words of our Lord to the Apostles: " You have not called me, but I have called you " apply to any summons which brings about a human sharing in the divine life. Faith is not an attitude and a knowledge which can be acquired by natural means. It is a gift of God, bestowed out of his freedom and bounty.

On the natural plane there must be many ways of overcoming the obstacles in human nature to the natural knowledge of God which the Book of Wisdom and St. Paul say we have been made capable of acquiring. If we could " lift up our eyes and see ", and reflect intelligently on what we have seen, we could have a natural introduction to the Creator of the Universe. In our mechanised urban civilisation we tend to restrict our vision to the traffic we must avoid, the bus we want to catch, the building we are making for. We see patches of sky and sparse vegetation and masses of man-made objects. The original creation of earth, sea and sky, and the vegetable and animal kingdoms,

are at several removes from our ordinary experience, and we can easily lose our sense of spaciousness and order, and the feeling of awe and wonder which should go with them. Control of the senses, the sharpening of perception, can remove our self-imposed limits and release the mind; but they do not necessarily lead to even natural religion.

A social psychologist whose lectures I am attending holds that no one is free. All human action is determined by heredity and environment. What is the answer?

A quick answer would be that his opinion on human nature is the product of his heredity and environment. It tells one something about himself but nothing about an external reality. Truth is not just the reception of impressions but a critical appraisal of them, the formation of a judgment about them, and a responsible (and therefore free) assertion of the judgment as true. Without freedom he is a mere tape-recorder playing himself back.

He seems to have succumbed to the besetting temptation of sociologists — to generalise about human nature after sampling human behaviour, setting up as authorities on the inner constitution of man on the strength of observation which is necessarily superficial. That heredity and environment are factors in anyone's action is self-evident. That many human beings are so far from being self-possessed that they are incapable of acting freely is unfortunately and increasingly true. But the conclusion to which determinism leads is so absurd that the grounds on which it is based must be false. If it were true, then our primary self-awareness, which tells us that we are responsible beings, would be untrustworthy; and nothing, then, in our self-consciousness would be dependable. We should be debarred completely from truth, and should therefore be unable to communicate with one another. Human society would fall to pieces. The social psychologist has to act as though human personality, with its powers of thinking and

loving, were a fact. He has either to assume intelligence and responsibility in his hearers and in the majority of mankind or to suppose that he and they have no more personality than the sensitive surface of a photographic film. That is materialism gone mad; and he has, in practice, to deny it in order to keep sane.

Sorry to return to a subject that you have already dealt with more than once; but can you tell me what authority religious have for abandoning the religious habit?

Your question is new, in that it is not about the abandonment of religious habits but about the authority for abandoning them. Several other readers have asked the same question, and I'm the more regretful that I cannot answer it confidently and conclusively. Some religious—I have no idea what proportion they are—have acted without authority, presenting their superiors with a *fait accompli* which the superiors have accepted for fear of open disobedience. Some religious Congregations have made provision in their chapter decrees for "experimentation", either the adoption of secular dress or the following of private taste in the modifying of the habit. With that permission, there are religious who have followed a taste for secularization and who wear the merest token of religious consecration on a secular dress. Presumably, chapter decrees were submitted to the highest authorities, so experimentation has sanction of some sort.

What the mind of the Church is in the matter you can judge for yourself. The Second Vatican Council, in the Decree, *Perfectae Caritatis*, on renewal in religious life, seems to suppose that all religious will wear a religious habit, and it calls the habit "a sign of consecration", a phrase quoted with strong approval by Pope Paul VI. That is the tradition of the Church from the time of the Fathers of the Desert. St. Basil says: "It is useful to be able to recognise by his clothing who each man is, and that he

is professed to live according to God ". He also mentions the protection that a habit gives to the wearer: " It is useful for the monk to know that his deeds ought to be in accordance with his dress ". The majority of religious keep to their habit, and it is they, I should think, who will get the good vocations, for the laity also are proud to recognise those who are " professed to live according to God ".

**One of the lecturers in my training college says he has "no use for Thomas Aquinas". Ought I to do anything about it ?**

I can think of no helpful action you can take beyond keeping the man (and his pupils) in your prayers. His words, if you have quoted them exactly, are remarkably foolish. They betray either an adolescent swagger or a feeling of superiority which is wholly unfounded. If he were a serious philosopher or theologian he could reasonably prefer another search for truth to the way chosen by St. Thomas; but he would know enough to respect the rare clarity of St. Thomas's thought and expression, and the monumental solidity of his *Summa*. Complaint of what is called the " intellectualism " of St. Thomas, the criticism that he limits truth by excess of definition, and that his theology is too cut-and-dried, may have some justification; but the defect, if there is one, is trivial compared with the richness of his work on which the Church has drawn gratefully for seven hundred years.

Your lecturer must know the unique distinction St. Thomas has. He is the only theologian to be recommended by name in a decree of an ecumenical council to the attention of the Church. The Decree of the Second Vatican Council, *Optatam totius*, on the training of priests, after saying that the biblical themes of doctrine should have first place, and after urging the study of the Fathers of the Church and the history of dogma, continues: " so as to clarify in the best way possible the mysteries of salvation, students should learn to go deeper into them and to see their interconnections by means of speculation with St.

Thomas as their teacher". Pope Paul VI made the same emphatic recommendation in an allocution to the Gregorian University in 1964. Has the lecturer no use for Pope and Council?

### What do Protestant bishops feel when they officiate in cathedrals built by Catholics ?

It is to be hoped that they feel they are doing their best to worship God as Christians. Given that kind of sincerity, they must have some theory of the divisions in Christianity which justifies their occupation of episcopal sees that were once in communion with the Pope and which had a liturgy based on what was then and still is Catholic doctrine but which in some essentials differs from theirs. One such theory used to be summarised on a placard in the nave of Salisbury cathedral. It stated—perhaps it still does—that the Roman Catholic part of the Church unfortunately seceded from the one Christian Church in the sixteenth century and has remained in schism ever since. I can't recall if the notice suggested any date for the beginnings of the secession. The see of Salisbury, like all the other bishoprics in England before the Reformation, was in communion with Rome for centuries, and shared with her the one Christian faith and worship. The Mass was the centre of the liturgy in Salisbury and throughout Christendom. It is a fact hard to reconcile with the theory of Rome's abandonment of unity that her "secession" brought about no change in her doctrines, whereas the church which claims strict conformity with the Christian tradition has made so many changes that the bishops of Salisbury from St. Osmund in 1080 to Richard Beauchamp in 1480 would not recognise it as Catholic.

Salisbury has now been Protestant for over four hundred years, a century longer than it was Catholic, so there need be no surprise if its present incumbents feel at home there, and not on alien ground.

# Book Review

**We Will Bury You**, edited by Brian Crozier; Tom Stacey, Ltd., 62.5np (paperback); pp. 182.

At the time when the late Senator Joseph McCarthy was waging his virulent anti-Communist campaign in the United States, I remember remarking that, if the man had not appeared on the American scene, the Communist Party would have had to put him there. Events have revealed my estimate as correct. The hysterical savagery of the Senator's own brand of anti-Communism made sane anti-Communism unacceptable. Overnight, as it were, the work of those who had done so much to lay bare the evil of Communism was subjected to sneers. They were accused of witch-hunting, told to stop looking for Reds under every bed, advised that the only way to dispose of Communism was through positive reform; which was about as logical as the impression given by many on the Left at the end of the thirties that, had Britain abolished her slums, Hitler would never have marched into Poland.

The mood generated by McCarthy has persisted until our own day. It is with us still and its ramifications have been wide. They could have been remotely responsible for preventing the Bishops at the second Vatican Council from making any outright condemnation of Communism as such. They may even have prompted within the Church the inclination for dialogue with Communists and the mode which sustains it to this day; a policy of detente to which the Communist adversary has reacted with a planned design that has been well described as that of sparing the shepherd and striking the flock. The general effect, however good and sincere the intentions of Catholic advocates of dialogue, has been to set at a discount all forms of anti-Communism within the Catholic Church. I cannot remember when I was last asked to talk to an audience on the evil that Communism undoubtedly is. It was a long, long

time ago. Minds are closed now, in this country as well as in the Church, to the threat that Communism undoubtedly represents. Men and women will come pouring out to demonstrate against South Africa or Franco's Spain. So far, however, as Communism is concerned, they just don't want to know. The tiny few who speak of the threat it constitutes are the subject only of sneers. The wonder is that they have found the courage to carry on. No small part of the value of the book under review lies in this, that it will enable them the more easily to do so.

For the book will reassure them that the attitude of watchful suspicion with which they have always viewed Communism is, indeed, amply justified and that there is no foundation whatsoever for the somewhat vacuous observation of a reviewer in the *Sunday Times* that the book "does not offer any very urgent reason for modifying the confident tolerance with which it (the menace of Communism) tends to be regarded now by most people, at least in Britain". Confident tolerance is just what most victims of Communism have had before it took them over. Indeed, it is exactly what the Soviet Union has been seeking (with great success) to instil into its prospective victims ever since the end of the second World War. The quotation from the *Sunday Times* review merely shows how successful the Soviets have been in their application to this country of their post-war policy. The more widespread in Britain this attitude of "confident tolerance", the easier the deception and the deeper, in consequence, the penetration of key areas as a prelude to final take-over. Any Catholic intellectual in this country who read the previous sentence would write off its writer as insane. Thereby he reveals himself and the many who think as he does, as the victim of Communist design.

The design is summed up most aptly in the title of the book under review, *We Will Bury You*. The words were spoken in superficial jest to the young John Kennedy shortly after his accession as President of the United States. Their underlying intent was deadly and completely in

line with what has always been and remains Communist intention: it is no more and no less than the enslavement of the world, and the policy in support of this intention, so far as the West is concerned, is to soften defences through the development in key intellectual circles of that attitude of "confident tolerance" to which the *Sunday Times* reviewer and so many like him have already fallen victim. Much will depend in the months and years that lie ahead on the hold exercised by Britain's intellectual flotsam on the real people of this country. What they need is awareness of the kind that rests on a firm foundation of fact. This is precisely what they will get from this excellent book. It has been excellently written by people who know their business. There is not one crank amongst them. It is a very sane book and a very healthy one. I know nothing better calculated to dispel that attitude of "confident tolerance" which is so prevalent in Britain today and which must be seen as the product not of a healthy mind, but of one that is sick with partial paralysis.

What makes *We Will Bury You* particularly significant for this country today is its description of Communism with reference to the contemporary British scene. There are, indeed, first-class chapters which deal with the theory and practice of contemporary Communism, where Tibor Szamuely writes with effective brilliance; and the international scene where David Williams presents an invaluable and, indeed, somewhat terrifying picture of Front Organizations. But it is when Williams himself and veteran Harry Welton get down to what is happening in our midst on this Island today that this first-class book, which is without a dull or uninformed page suddenly jumps up at the reader, so to say, and hits him in the face. The facts are devastating and, in the case of both writers, they are presented without a trace of feverish strain, but with the easy, compact authority of those who know exactly what they are talking about. The picture is a grim one, particularly when it deals with the growing Communist influence in the trade unions, the Red Base strategy in the universities, the new

and not unsuccessful attempts to penetrate secondary schools and the heavy infiltration into the Civil Service which was described as long ago as 1962 by the Redcliffe Committee in the following terms:

"In addition, we think that the dangers of the present situation are aggravated by the fact that very few people are aware they exist. We recommend that, without jeopardising secret sources of information, Heads of Departments and Principal Establishment Officers should be told more frankly than we believe to be the present practice, the scale of Communist penetration of the Civil Service unions and should be warned of the identity of individual Communists with whom they are likely to have dealings. More generally we think that Civil Servants who take part in staff negotiations should be warned in general terms that the Communist representation among Civil Service unions is disproportionately high".

In the light of these grave words, anyone who thinks that "confident tolerance" is still called for as an appropriate attitude, shows himself as unfitted, I would suggest, to comment on the contemporary scene. The Macmillan Government accepted the safeguards recommended by the Redcliffe Committee on April 5th, 1962. One is entitled to wonder how effectively they have maintained during the past nine years. "Confident tolerance" may have made its entry once again to blind those in responsible positions to the realities of the situation. The Communist Party will undoubtedly have made all efforts possible to see that this was the case.

A final word for Catholic readers of this review. David Williams writes on page ninety-six:

"The Soviet Union has also been exerting itself to promote religious gatherings as 'fronts' to rally more 'progressives' to its cause but these have not been conspicuously successful. The basic document of the July 1969 World Communist Conference said the time was ripe to enlist 'broad masses of religious people' in

the anti-imperialist struggle and urged Communists to take advantage of the 'ideological crisis which is shattering the age-long concepts and existing structures of the Catholic Church and other religious organisations'. Before the opening of the Moscow conference, prominent members of foreign churches and representatives of all religious denominations in the Soviet Union had been invited by the Moscow Patriarchate to a four-day world meeting which opened on 1 July in the monastery town of Zagorsk.

"The chairman of the preparatory committee, Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad and Novgorod, stated that the purpose of the conference was to awaken and strengthen all believers' responsibilities for world peace, and, 'in the face of the increasing tension in many parts of the world, to work out authoritative recommendations and fraternal appeals'. In keeping with the conference's implicit political ends, its agenda was almost indistinguishable from that of the 'peace' conference in East Berlin, concentrating on such items as Vietnam, European Security, the Middle East and colonialism in the context of the 'struggle against imperialism', which rated a separate statement.

"However, the Zagorsk meeting failed in its main aim of attracting influential churchmen from abroad. No Western church leaders of note attended".

One can be thankful that influential churchmen from abroad did not attend the meeting at Zagorsk. At the same time, it is essential to realise that the impact of revolutionary Communism in its various guises is making itself felt within the Catholic Church. The shepherds, indeed, may be spared, but the flock is being struck by clerical subversives whose obtuse acceptance of Moscow's new brand of "Christian Marxism", with its anti-American and anti-West overtones, is proving to be what Lenin always said it would be, one of the most effective of Communism's contemporary tools.

(This book should be bought and studied and then

passed on by every reader of *Christian Order*. Those who wish for more — in the shape of intelligent information concerning the contemporary Communist scene in this country — should apply without delay for membership of Common Cause, an organisation receiving long-overdue recognition these days as a model of well-balanced, sane and effective anti-Communism. Its *Bulletin*, edited by David Williams, is a mine of most useful, factual information concerning the Communist position in contemporary Britain. Its fortnightly *Report* is in the same line of country and very helpful indeed. The address to write to is 2-3 Norfolk Street, Strand, London, W.C.2. Membership brings the literature and it costs a minimum of one guinea a year; or, as I suppose it should now be called, one pound and five new pence.

Paul Crane, S.J.

---

### *The State and not the Market*

"The American Corporate State today can be thought of as a single vast corporation, with every person as an involuntary member and employee . . . The Corporate State is a complete reversal of the original American ideal. The State, and not the market or the people or any abstract economic laws, determines what shall be produced, what shall be consumed, and how it shall be allocated. It determines, for example, that railroads shall decay while highways flourish; that coal miners shall be poor and advertising executives rich. Jobs and occupations in the society are rigidly defined and controlled, and arranged in a hierarchy of rewards, status and authority." From the *Greening of America*, by Charles A. Reich.